

Appl. No. 10/542,225
Amdt. Dated January 19, 2007
Reply to Office Action of October 20, 2006

Attorney Docket No. 81887.0128
Customer No.: 26021

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Minor changes are made to this specification. Claims 1, 5, 7, and 11 are the independent claims. Claims 5 and 11 are amended. Claims 1-12 are pending in the application. Reexamination and reconsideration of the application, as amended, are respectfully requested.

CLAIM REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-4 and 7-10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ahmed (U.S. Patent No. 6,782,261) in view of Hideki (JP 2001-128210); claims 5 and 11 stand rejected under the same over Ahmed in view of Zhao (U.S. Patent No. 7,006,473); Claims 6 and 12 stand rejected under the same over Ahmed in view of Stanislaw (JP 2000-201369). Applicant respectfully traverses herein the rejection with respect to the claim as amended.

INDEPENDENT CLAIMS 1 AND 7

Independent claim 1 recites the following:

A wireless communication terminal comprising:
a measurement section that measures quality of a signal transmitted from a base station;
a determination section that determines whether or not handoff is to be performed based on a measurement result of the measurement section and a criterion of the determination of the handoff; and
a handoff section that performs the handoff based on a determination result of the determination section,
wherein the determination section changes the criterion of the determination of the handoff when the handoff section performs the handoff in a predetermined repetition pattern.

Appl. No. 10/542,225
Amdt. Dated January 19, 2007
Reply to Office Action of October 20, 2006

Attorney Docket No. 81887.0128
Customer No.: 26021

First, Ahmed is not seen to disclose, "the determination section changes the criterion of the determination of the handoff when the handoff section performs the handoff in a predetermined repetition pattern," as recited in independent claim 1.

Office Action at page 4, line 9-10 asserts that Ahmed discloses a method of recalculating the threshold value (dynamic add threshold, or DAT). According to Ahmed, DAT is determined as a function of the total detected energy of the pilots in the active set (*Ahmed at col. 6, lines 35-65*).

However, Ahmed teaches only that the mobile station measures the signal strength of a candidate set pilot against a dynamic ADD threshold (DAT), which is determined as a function of the total detected energy of the active set pilots. Ahmed does not teach recalculating of the threshold value. That is, Ahmed does not disclose or suggest changing a threshold value according to a predetermined method.

Second, the Office Action takes notice that Ahmed does not disclose or suggest, "wherein the determination section changes the criterion of the determination of the handoff when the handoff section performs the handoff in a predetermined repetition pattern," as recited in claim 1. Accordingly, the Office Action cites Hideki to remedy the deficiencies of Ahmed.

Hideki is directed to a method of reducing the number of handovers to reduce battery consumption in a mobile communication system. According to Hideki, the mobile system records the frequency of handovers. When the frequency reaches a threshold, the mobile system reduces the frequency of handover (*see Hideki: (57) abstract, SOLUTION*). Here, Hideki determines the frequency of handovers, and not a predetermined repetition pattern as recited in claim 1.

The Specification at page 11, line 19 – page 14, line 15 discloses an example of the predetermined repetition pattern. Here, the predetermined repetition

Appl. No. 10/542,225
Amdt. Dated January 19, 2007
Reply to Office Action of October 20, 2006

Attorney Docket No. 81887.0128
Customer No.: 26021

pattern is first base station-second base station-first base station-second base station. The frequency of handover is the number of handover divided by a time period; it is not concerned with the identification of the base stations. Accordingly, the frequency of handover is not a predetermined repetition pattern.

Since Ahmed and Hideki do not disclose all the features of independent claim 1, that claim is allowable over Ahmed and Zhao.

Independent claim 7 recites similar features as claim 1 and is therefore also allowable over Ahmed and Zhao. The allowance of claims 1 and 7 is respectfully requested.

Claims 2-4, 6, 8-10, and 12 depend from claims 1 or 7 are also allowable for at least the same reasons as their respective parent claims.

INDEPENDENT CLAIMS 5 AND 11

Regarding amended independent claim 5, it recites the following:

A wireless communication terminal comprising:

a measurement section that measures quality of a signal transmitted from a base station;

a determination section that determines whether or not handoff is to be performed based on a measurement result of the measurement section and a criterion of the determination of the handoff; and

a handoff section that performs the handoff based on a determination result of the determination section,

wherein the determination section determines whether or not the handoff is to be performed based on a value obtained by time-averaging the measurement result of the measurement section immediately after a prior handoff is performed, and determines whether or not the handoff is to be performed based on a value obtained by number-averaging the measurement result of the measurement section after a lapse of a predetermined period since the prior handoff is performed.

Appl. No. 10/542,225
Amdt. Dated January 19, 2007
Reply to Office Action of October 20, 2006

Attorney Docket No. 81887.0128
Customer No.: 26021

The Office Action takes notice that Ahmed does not disclose or suggest, "wherein the determination section determines whether or not the handoff is to be performed based on a value obtained by time-averaging the measurement result of the measurement section immediately after a prior handoff is performed," and "determines whether or not the handoff is to be performed based on a value obtained by number-averaging the measurement result of the measurement section after a lapse of a predetermined period since the prior handoff is performed," recited in claim 5.

The ancillary Zhao reference also does not disclose or suggest the above features. Zhao is directed to a CDMA handover method. According to Zhao, pilot signal strength is measured continuously and compared to a T-DROP value and a T-ADD value. A mobile station is initially using base station A. When base station B's pilot signal strength goes above T-DROP value, the station enters the candidate list. When base station B's pilot signal strength goes above T-ADD, the mobile station initiates the handover process to base station B (*see Zhao: FIG. 2, Reference No. 7; col. 5, lines 5-8*). When the base station A's pilot signal strength goes below T-DROP, the mobile station initiates the termination process (*see Zhao: FIG. 2, Reference No. 10; col. 5, lines 13-15*).

Here, Zhao teaches the pilot signal strength being continuously measured. However, Zhao is silent regarding "time-average" and "number-averaging," let alone disclosing the features relating thereto recited in claim 5. Moreover, Zhao does not use the term "averaging" or "averaging" at all. Therefore, Zhao cannot disclose or suggest the features of claim 5.

Since Ahmed and Zhao do not disclose all the features of independent claim 5, that claim is allowable over Ahmed and Zhao.

Appl. No. 10/542,225
Amdt. Dated January 19, 2007
Reply to Office Action of October 20, 2006

Attorney Docket No. 81887.0128
Customer No.: 26021

Independent claim 11 recites similar features as claim 5 and is therefore also allowable over Ahmed and Zhao. The allowance of claims 5 and 11 is respectfully requested.

Claims 6 and 12 depend from independent claims 7 or 11 are also allowable for at least the same reasons as their respective parent claims.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Reexamination and reconsideration of the application, as amended, are requested.

If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorney at the Los Angeles, California telephone number (310) 785-4600 to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance.

If there are any fees due in connection with the filing of this response, please charge the fees to our Deposit Account No. 50-1314.

Respectfully submitted,
HOGAN & HARTSON L.L.P.

Date: January 19, 2007

By: 

Lawrence J. McClure
Registration No. 44,228
Attorney for Applicant(s)

1999 Avenue of the Stars, Suite 1400
Los Angeles, California 90067
Phone: 310-785-4600
Fax: 310-785-4601